



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,484	05/24/2001	Ronald S. Cok	82831THC	2988

7590 06/10/2003
Thomas H. Close
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, LEONID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2673

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/864,484

Applicant(s)

COK, RONALD S.

Examiner

Leonid Shapiro

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-11 and 15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-11 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan et al. (US Patent No. 6,483,498 B1) in view of Wolk et al. (US Patent No. 6, 485, 884 B2).

As to claim 1, Colgan et al. teaches a touch screen for use with LCD display with: a substrate having a top and bottom side (See Figs. 1-3, items 24,32,8,18, in description See from Col. 4, Line 27 to Col.5, Line 20); a plurality of touch screen elements located on the top side of substrate (See Fig. 1, items 18, 32, in description See Col. 4, Lines 59-64); a polarizing element, wherein the polarizing element is an integral part of substrate (See Fig. 1, item 24, in description See Col. 4, Lines 30-33 and Col. 1, Lines 10-11).

Colgan et al. does not show a polarizing element for reducing glare and improving contrast for use with an organic light emitting diode (OLED).

Wolk et al. teaches a polarizing element for reducing glare and improving contrast for use with OLED display (See Fig. 1a, items 100, 130, in description See Col. 9, Lines 10-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use OLED display as shown by Wolk et al. in Colgan et al. apparatus in order to reduce glare and improve contrast of the OLED display (See Col. 9, Lines 25-30 and Col. 21, Lines 60-65 in the Wolk et al. reference).

Art Unit: 2673

As to claim 5, Colgan et al. teaches the substrate of the display also serves as a cover sheet (See Fig. 1, item 24, in description See Col. 4, Lines 59-65).

Golgan et al. does not teach the OLED display is a top emitting display.

Wolk et al. teaches the OLED display is a top emitting (See Fig. 1b, items 150, 152a, 152b, in description See Col. 9, Lines 43-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use OLED display as shown by Wolk et al. in Colgan et al. apparatus in order to reduce glare and improve contrast of the OLED display (See Col. 9, Lines 25-30 and Col. 21, Lines 60-65 in the Wolk et al. reference).

As to claim 6, Colgan et al. does not teach the OLED display is a bottom emitting display having a substrate on which are deposited organic light emitting elements that emit light through the substrate of the display.

Wolk et al. teaches the OLED display is a bottom emitting display having a substrate on which are deposited organic light emitting elements that emit light through the substrate of the display (See Fig. 1a, items 120, 110, in description See Col. 8, Lines 48-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use OLED display as shown by Wolk et al. in Colgan et al. apparatus in order to reduce glare and improve contrast of the OLED display (See Col. 9, Lines 25-30 and Col. 21, Lines 60-65 in the Wolk et al. reference).

As to claim 7, Colgan et al. teaches the touch screen is a resistive wire touch screen (See in description Col. 4, Lines 30-34).

Art Unit: 2673

2. Claims 8-9, 11, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan et al. and Walk et al. as aforementioned in claims 1,7 in view of Quist et al. (US 2002/0044065 A1) .

Colgan et al. and Walk et al. do not show a four-wire, a five-wire or a capacitive touch screen.

Quist et al. teaches a four-wire, a five-wire or a capacitive touch screen (See Fig. 5-6, item 26, in description See Col. 6, paragraph 0046). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use a four-wire, a five-wire or a capacitive touch screen as shown by Quist et al. in Wolk et al. and Colgan et al. apparatus in order to reduce glare and improve contrast of the OLED display (See Col. 9, Lines 25-30 and Col. 21, Lines 60-65 in the Wolk et al. reference).

3. Claim 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan et al. and Walk et al. as aforementioned in claim 1 in view of Duwaer (US Patent No. 5,402,151).

Golgan et al. and Walk et al. do not show a surface acoustic wave touch screen.

Duwaer. teaches a surface acoustic wave touch screen (See Fig. 1, items 10,16,18,20,22,24, in description See Col. 6, Line18-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use a surface acoustic wave touch screen as shown by Duwaer in Wolk et al. and Colgan et al. apparatus in order to reduce glare and improve contrast of the OLED display (See Col. 9, Lines 25-30 and Col. 21, Lines 60-65 in the Wolk et al. reference).

Art Unit: 2673

4. Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan et al. and Walk et al. as aforementioned in claim 1 in view of Albro et al. (US Patent No. 6,403,223 B1).

Golgan et al. and Walk et al. do not show a circular polarizer as polarizing element.

Albro et al. teaches a circular polarizer as polarizing element (See Fig. 2b, items 12,20, in description See Col. 10, Line 24-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use a circular polarizer as polarizing element as shown by Albro et al. in Wolk et al. and Colgan et al. apparatus in order to reduce glare and improve contrast of the OLED display (See Col. 9, Lines 25-30 and Col. 21, Lines 60-65 in the Wolk et al. reference).

Response to Amendment

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 05-13-03 with respect to claims 1, 5-11, 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2673

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The Hung et al. (US Patent No. 6,429,451 B1) reference discloses reduction of ambient-light-reflection in OLED.

The May (US Patent No. 6,211,613 B1) reference discloses high contrast electroluminescent displays.

The Doany et al. (US Patent No. 5,796,509) reference discloses thin film frontlighting and backlighting for spatial light modulation.

Telephone inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 703-305-5661. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 703-305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2673

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

Is
June 6, 2003



BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000